

## REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-7 remain pending in the application. By the foregoing Amendment, claims 1 and 7 are amended.

On page 2 of the Office Action, independent claims 1 and 7, along with various dependent claims, are rejected as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,425,008 to Lecheler et al. (Lecheler); and on page 4 of the Office Action, dependent claims 4 and 5 are rejected as being unpatentable over the Lecheler patent. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants have disclosed that when a management computer receives event information including the identifier tag and when the management computer needs to display or use the source of an event, the management computer can, for example, derive the domain name of the collection computer from the identifier tag contained in the event (see, e.g., the specification at paragraph [0024]). Such an exemplary identification of domain of a collection station at the management station provides for a unique identification of the source of an event.

The foregoing features are broadly encompassed by claims 1 and 7. For example, the Lecheler patent does not disclose or suggest "deriving, by the at least one management computer, an identification of at least one collection computer from the identifier tag based on a domain name; and identifying to a user the source of an event using the identification of each collection computer," as recited in claim 1, and as similarly cited in claim 7.

The Examiner asserts at page 5 of the Office Action that "level two manager receives unique identification of the level one manager (the collection computer), from which identification derivation (through an identifier tag) takes place as to which collection computer sent this information." This assertion is respectfully traversed.

The Lecheler patent uses a level one manager to detect errors within a customer domain 12, and to produce an error signal as well as a unique location identifier (which identifies a location of the error). See column 4, lines 15-42. A unique identification of the source of the event is not resolved at a management computer by deriving an identification of at least one collection computer from an identifier tag based on a domain name. For example, as shown in Fig. 3 of the Lecheler patent the mapping table 84 which converts the network address into a unique domain name resides with the level 1 manager 34, and not the Fig. 1 "Level 2 Manager 40."

The Examiner asserts at page 5 of the Office Action that "The identification of a domain name is not a claimed element, and is thus disregarded." This assertion is respectfully traversed in view of the currently amended claims. Applicants' claim 1, for example, recites, among other features, "the identifier tag uniquely identifies at least one collection computer monitoring the event based on a domain name. The Lecheler patent does not disclose or suggest at least these recited claimed features.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant's claims 1 and 7 are allowable over the Lecheler patent. The remaining claims depend from independent claim 1 and recite additional advantageous features which further distinguish over the document relied upon by the Examiner. As such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

All objections and rejections raised in the Office Action having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

By:   
Fay No. 48,360  
Patrick C. Keane  
Registration No. 32,858

Date: June 7, 2005

P.O. Box 1404  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404  
(703) 836-6620